

REMARKS

Summary Of Office Action

Claims 1-36 are pending in this application.

Claims 9-20, 22, and 27-35 are allowed.

Claims 21, 23, 24, and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-8, 23, and 25-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from PRIOR ART as shown in FIG. 1 (hereinafter "PA") in view of Wu et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,100,736 (hereinafter "Wu").

Claim 36 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Lin U.S. Patent No. 6,812,753 (hereinafter "Lin") in view of PA in further view of Wu.

Summary of Applicant's Reply

Applicant appreciates the allowance of claims 9-20, 22, and 27-35. Applicant also appreciates the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 21 and 24.

Applicant has amended claims 21, 24, and 36 to more particularly define the invention. Applicant has also amended claims 19-22, 24, 27, and 33-36 to correct minor clerical and typographical errors. Applicant has cancelled claims 1-8, 23, 25, and 26 without prejudice. No new matter has been added and the amendments are fully supported and justified by the specification.

Reconsideration of this application in view of the amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicant's Reply to the
Indefiniteness Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 21 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

More particularly, the Examiner rejected claim 21 as not having antecedent basis for the term "said receiving," and claim 24 as not having antecedent basis for the term "said generated periodic reference signal." Applicant has amended claim 21 to replace "said receiving" with "receiving said periodic reference signal." Applicant has amended claim 24 to replace "said generated periodic reference signal" with "said generated periodic signal." Applicant respectfully submits that claims 21 and 24, as amended, are not indefinite, and respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Applicant's Amendments to Claim 36

The Examiner rejected claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention and under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Lin in view of PA in further view of Wu.

Applicant has amended independent claim 36 to incorporate features of allowable claim 24. Thus, amended independent claim 36 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 24.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claim 36 be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/734,339
March 16, 2005 Reply To Office Action

Conclusion

The foregoing demonstrates that claims 9-22, 24, and 27-36 are allowable. This application is therefore in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are accordingly respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Chasan
Registration No. 54,026
Agent for Applicant

FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP
ROPES & GRAY LLP
Customer No. 1473
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020-1105
(212) 596-9000